



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,323	06/23/2003	Shlomo Turgeman	1267VBX-US	6576
7590 12/15/2005			EXAMINER	
Dekel Patent Ltd. Beit HaRofim Room 27 18 Menuha VeNahala Street Rehovot, 76209 ISRAEL			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2674	
DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,323

Applicant(s)

TURGEMAN, SHLOMO

Examiner

Stephen G. Sherman

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 26 October 2005.
Claims 11-4, 6-7 and 9-13 are pending and claims 5 and 8 cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 26 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In paragraph 11 of the applicant's remarks, the applicant argues against the rejection of claim 8 (or 9 or 11) applied in the earlier office action rejection. The applicant argues that neither Belmont et al. nor Ishikawa et al. has two power sources. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant cites col. 7, lines 27-40 of Ishikawa et al. to show that Ishikawa et al. only teaches of one power source. However, the examiner again points out that his interpretation of Ishikawa et al. is that the common external power source, item 123 of Figure 1, is a general power source, and that the battery, item 108, is a first power source. The common external power source is provided to combine the power supplies of the printer, item 117, and the digital camera, item 109. The examiner interprets that if the AC power source, item 123, was shut off, that the digital camera would continue functioning because of this power source, battery item 108, even when the printer is turned off.

In paragraph 12 of the applicant's remarks, the applicant argues against the combination of Belmont et al. and Ishikawa et al. as applied to claim 8 (or 9 or 11) in the earlier office action rejection. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Belmont et al. teaches of a TV/PC system that has only one power source. Ishikawa et al. teaches of consolidating different devices around a common external power source, while one of those devices, the digital camera item 109 of Figure 1, has a secondary power source so as to function independently from the rest of the system if the common external power source is turned off. Ishikawa et al. also mentions of conserving power by turning devices off in column 7, lines 10-14. The examiner interprets that during other periods of time besides image transfer that power could be shut off to multiple devices or the entire system in order to conserve power and that the battery could be used to power the digital camera during this power saving mode. Therefore by incorporating the power management distribution system taught by Ishikawa et al. into the TV/PC convergence device taught by Belmont et al. a combined system is formed

which has the ability to shut power off to the entire system while still having one of the devices operating by its own independent power source.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belmont et al. (US 6,119,172) in view of APA and further in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 6,526,516).

Regarding claim 1, Belmont et al. disclose a system comprising:

a television (TV) comprising a TV display screen (Figure 1, items 14 and 12. The examiner's interpretation is that item 12, shown as an output, could be a TV display screen);

a personal computer (PC) comprising a PC display screen (Figure 1, items 16 and 24. The examiner's interpretation is that item 24 contains a display screen that is the PC display screen);

a processor in communication with said TV display screen and said PC display screen (Figure 1, item 24. Item 24 is interpreted by the examiner as possessing a processing unit),

said processor being operative to process TV signals for viewing TV images in three display formats, a first display format for displaying said TV images on said TV display screen (Column 2, lines 1-5 where it states "...operable in television mode" is interpreted by the examiner as meaning that the TV images can be displayed on the TV display screen),

a second display format for displaying said TV images in a window on said PC display screen (Column 2, lines 1-5 where it states "...operable in... a television/computer mode" is interpreted by the examiner to mean that the TV images are displayed in a window on the computer), and

a third display format for displaying said TV images on said PC display screen so as to appear similar to said TV images displayed on said TV display screen (Column 2, lines 1-5 where it states "...operable in a television mode" is interpreted by the examiner to mean that TV images can be displayed on the PC display screen in that mode), and

a user switching interface connected to at least one of said PC display screen, said PC, and TV display screen and said TV, for selecting one of said three display formats (column 4, lines 40-45 where it states "including a controlled device for controlling the elective interfacing between said television and said computer").

Belmont et al. fail to teach of a system wherein said processor comprises a module embodied on a printed circuit board.

The applicant's admittance to prior art teaches of a processor comprising a module being embodied on a printed circuit board on page 1 of the specification, 2nd paragraph where it is stated: "Some systems permit displaying TV images on a TV screen from a PC equipped with a printed circuit board (PCB) that includes components for receiving TV signals and decoding signals for display on the screen."

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the prior art with the TV/PC convergence device of Belmont et al. in order to allow for easier integration of the module into the system.

Belmont et al. and the applicant's admittance to prior art fail to teach of a system further comprising a first power source connected to said module, and a general power source operative to power said PC, wherein the first power source is operative to supply power to said module independently from said general power source even when said general power source does not supply power to said PC.

Ishikawa teaches of two devices that are interconnected containing different power sources such that the devices can be run independently of each other (The

examiner interprets that the common external power source, item 123 of Figure 1, is a general power source, and that the battery, item 108, is a first power source. The common external power source is provided to combine the power supplies of the printer, item 117, and the digital camera, item 109. The examiner interprets that if the AC power source, item 123, was shut off, that the digital camera would continue functioning because of this power source, battery item 108, even when the printer is turned off.

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made that by incorporating the power management distribution system taught by Ishikawa et al. into the TV/PC convergence device taught by Belmont et al. a combined system is formed which has the ability to shut power off to the entire system while still having one of the devices operating by its own independent power source, i.e. watch TV on a separate PC screen while the PC is turned off.

Regarding claim 6, Belmont et al., APA and Ishikawa et al. disclose the system according to claim 1. Belmont et al. also disclose wherein said module is installed in said PC (Column 1 lines 23-24: "The convergence of the personal computer and the television into a single device..." The examiner interprets this that since there is only one device the module would have to be stored inside of it, that device including the PC).

6. Claims 2- 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belmont et al. (US 6,119,172), in view of APA and further in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 6,526,516) and Brusky et al. (US Patent 6,262,713).

Belmont et al., APA and Ishikawa et al. teach all of the limitations of claims 2-4 except wherein said user switching interface comprises a keyboard, mouse or remote control device.

Brusky et al. teach of a user switching interface comprising of a keyboard, mouse or remote control device (Figure 2, items 38, 40 and 18. Column 3 lines 50-55 it states "...and remote controls for remote input 18" meaning that item 18 is a remote input device. Column 4 lines 33-40 it states "Computer system 10 includes...a hardwire keyboard 38, mouse 40...").

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brusky et al. with the system of Belmont et al. in order to allow for different ways in which the user of the system can switch between the different display modes.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belmont et al. (US 6,119,172) in view of APA and further in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 6,526,516) and Farrow et al. (US Patent 6,680,843).

Belmont et al. (US 6,119,172), APA and Ishikawa et al. (US 6,526,516) teach all of the limitations of claim 7 except wherein said module is installed in a PC monitor associated with said PC display screen.

Farrow teaches of a computer system wherein all of the components are located in the PC monitor (Column 1, lines 20-25 states "In unitary systems, as the term in here used, information handling element of the system such as the central processor, associated memory, drives and options such as modems or network interface cards are housed in a common housing with the display or monitor.").

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farrow with the processor comprising a module embodied on a printed circuit board from claim 5 and the system from claim 1 in order to create a unitary computer system that takes up less desk space and allows easier portability.

8. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the primary Belmont et al. (US Patent 6,119,172) in view of Ishikawa (US Patent 6,526,516).

Regarding claim 9, Belmont teaches of a system comprising:

a module installed in a PC operative to output TV signals in a format suitable for display on a TV screen (Column 2 lines 55-57 where it states: "When in typical television mode, information received from TV/video/data source 22 is displayed on a

display device of TV 14.” The examiner interprets this as saying that the TV/PC convergence device disclosed by the primary contains a module in its PC that can output TV signals to a TV screen).

Belmont fails to teach of a first power source connected to said module; and a general power source operative to power said PC, wherein said first power source is operative to supply power to said module independently from said general power source even when said general power source does not supply power to said PC.

Ishikawa teaches of two separate power sources such that can be run independently of each other in Figure 1 as explained in the rejection of claim 1. Item 123 of the figure represents an AC adapter which is connected to item 117 that represents a printer, which is then connected to item 109, a digital camera, which contains item 108 a battery. In column 1 lines 1-3 it is stated: “This invention relates to a power control system and method for supplying power to a system to which a plurality of devices are connected.” The examiner understands this to mean that items 117 and 109 could be any number of devices such as a personal computer and a processor, where the AC adapter, item 123 powers the computer and item 108, the battery could power the processor independently from the AC power source.

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ishikawa with the TV/PC convergence device of Belmont in order to allow to the independent function of the two devices (the television and the computer) such that one could watch television without the computer having to be on therefore saving power.

Regarding claim 10, Belmont and Ishikawa teach all of the limitations of claim 10. Wherein said first power source comprises a battery is taught in Ishikawa Figure 1, item 108, which shows a battery.

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ishikawa with the first power source of claim 9 in order to allow for a smaller power source that would take up less space.

Regarding claim 11, Belmont teaches outputting television (TV) signals in a format suitable for display on a TV screen from a module installed on a personal computer (PC) (Column 2 lines 1-5 where it states, “The present invention further provides a TV/PC convergence device operable in a television mode...” The examiner interprets this as meaning that if the device is capable of being operable in a television mode it must also possess a method of outputting those signals for display on a TV screen from the computer containing a processor).

Belmont, however, fails to teach of said module being powered by a first power source independent from a general power source of said PC.

Ishikawa teaches of two separate power sources such that can be run independently of each other in Figure 1. Item 123 of the figure represents an AC adapter which is connected to item 117 that represents a printer, which is then connected to item 109, a digital camera, which contains item 108 a battery. In column 1

lines 1-3 it is stated: "This invention relates to a power control system and method for supplying power to a system to which a plurality of devices are connected." The examiner understands this to mean that items 117 and 109 could be any number of devices such as a personal computer and a processor, where the AC adapter, item 123 powers the computer and item 108, the battery could power the processor independently from the AC power source.

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ishikawa with the TV/PC convergence device of Belmont et al. in order to allow to the independent function of the two devices (the television and the computer) such that one could watch television without the computer having to be on, therefore saving power.

Regarding claim 12, Belmont and Ishikawa teach all of the limitations of claim 12. The method according to claim 11, further comprising displaying said TV signals as a TV picture on a TV screen is taught by Belmont et al. (Column 2, lines 1-5 where it states "The present invention further provides a TV/PC convergence device operable in a television mode..." is interpreted by the examiner to mean that if the device is operable in television mode it must provide a method for displaying the TV signals as a TV picture on the TV screen).

Regarding claim 13, Belmont and Ishikawa teach all of the limitations of claim 12 as presented in claim 11. Ishikawa further teaches of outputting said TV signals to

said TV screen while the PC is turned off (Figure 1 as described in the section regarding claim 11, shows item 108 being a battery and item 123 as an AC adapter for providing 2 separate power supplies in that one could be on and one could be off).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method provided in claim 11 of having 2 power sources with Ishikawa's teaching of having one power source off while the other was still on in order to provide a power saving feature where the TV can be supplied with a signal regardless of whether the PC is on or off.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2674

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brusky (US Patent 6,285,406) discloses a power management system for a convergence device.

Naiff (US Patent 5,982,363) discloses of a PC acting as a set-top box for a TV.

Fukuhara (US 2003/0028677) discloses a control system using 2 power sources.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2674

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

8 December 2005